

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on March 15, 2005, at 1:00 p.m., in 36 Gerberding. Chair Dan Luchtel called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

Synopsis:

1. Promotion Procedures (Wilson)
2. Review Ramsey Interview
3. Update on SCFW and SCMFA name and status change
4. New Business – Problems surfacing with Research Faculty and the vote

The minutes were approved, the agenda was approved.

Promotion Procedures Chapter 24.54

Background: At the February 8 meeting, the Council considered this proposed legislation and tentatively decided that changes to the Code regarding who should be considered for the annual Promotion & Tenure process, and requiring written feedback on P&T decisions, may not be needed – the current language is intentionally general enough to apply to all schools and colleges, but specific enough to apply to each department. Deans and chairs can be more frank with candidates if there is no requirement to provide a written document. It may not be worth adding extra documentation for the one case where the process doesn't work well.

In the section on self-recusals for conflict of interest, however, it was agreed "may be excused" should be revised to read "shall be excused." Lea Vaughn also asked that all the proposed revisions be revisited when sponsor Bill Wilson is present, to make certain the Council understands his concerns and his intent.

Current discussion: Today, Wilson clarified that he intended to allow faculty members to opt out of the process. At present, Wilson interprets the Code to mean that all faculty shall be considered whether they want to be considered or not. His department has found this process cumbersome and would like to provide an "opt-out" clause.

Lea Vaughn countered that the Code speaks in generalities, while department actions are specific. Academic Personnel tells departments who has to be considered, others are not required to be considered. Their consideration is governed by the annual conference specified in Chapter 24.57, when a decision is made as to whether Assistant Professors are being considered or not. The Code in 24.54 describes the procedures for those who are already known to be going ahead with the P&T process. Vaughn believes that most departments understand this. She was not in favor of going through the entire Class A legislation process to clarify language that she believes 98% of departments understand. She recommended instead that Cheryl Cameron have a conference with any Deans or Chairs who don't thoroughly understand the process.

Jan Sjavik commented that, at present, one's colleagues have the responsibility for determining who goes up for P&T and who does not. If the individual becomes responsible for making that determination, some collegiality would be lost. Katherine Graubard saw a mentoring issue, where some new faculty are not told by their chairs when they will be reviewed and what the process is. This can be addressed by the new faculty orientation. There can also be problems where newer faculty are not told in understandable terms why a particular P&T decision was made or what to expect next. This failing probably cannot be legislated, but administrators could mentor departments to improve the process. Cheryl Cameron suggested that this be discussed as an agenda item at faculty meetings.

For candidates who are turned down, Wilson said, he has had difficulty getting P&T decisions in writing and believes candidates should be told in writing why they were not promoted. Vaughn said this cannot always be done, because sometimes the decision has little to do with the candidate and more to do with larger departmental

constraints. There are some things deans won't put in writing, and there is presently no Code requirement for deans to put their decisions in writing. It may be appropriate to require that a negative decision at the college council or dean level must generate specific feedback to the chair within 14 days.

After further discussion, it was decided that Wilson will redraft the proposed legislation and present it at the April 4 meeting. If approved by the Council, the legislation will then be prepared for submission in Fall 2005.

Paul Ramsey Interview

A brief discussion revealed that the will of the Council is to move this long-standing agenda item out of the draft report stage and submit it to the Faculty Senate in response to the original Class C resolution before the end of this academic year. The finished product should probably be a two-stage report, as follows:

1. Inquiries and findings in response to the Class C resolution
2. Dicta (editorial comments) on phenomena, fallout and misinformation that arose during and after the billing investigation and settlements, plus suggestions as to what Ramsey could do to improve transparency and two-way communication in the Medical School. (example: "We heard repeatedly that the following has been said" followed by Ramsey's explanation and the Council's comments)

As a followup, it may also be possible to gauge the level of current faculty concern over this issue by asking Rusty Barcelo to include some general questions about it in the campus climate survey her office is currently preparing on WebQ.

Luchtel will re-write the draft report over Spring Break and bring it to the Council for discussion at the April 4th meeting.

SCFW and SCMFA Name and Status Change

At the behest of the Senate Executive Committee, the Special Committee on Faculty Women and the Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs (which now report to FCFA) are proposing Class A legislation to become full-fledged councils. These two ad hoc committees have existed for 30 years and 22 years, respectively, and have much work to do that can better be done independently and as fully functioning enfranchised Faculty Councils. In addition, this move will reduce FCFA's workload somewhat. The legislation must be submitted by FCFA, since neither committee now has council standing.

After brief discussion, it was moved, seconded and passed to communicate to SEC and the Faculty Senate that FCFA submits and supports this legislation. Legislation and rationales have been written by Committee Chairs Dina Mandoli and Brian Fabien, and will be sponsored at SEC by Dan Luchtel.

Research Faculty and the Vote

Legislation that was passed giving full-time research faculty the vote needs to be revisited, Lea Vaughn told the Council, because it is not working as intended. Some departments complain that they cannot achieve quorum for faculty meetings because research faculty do not attend, while others have adopted the practice of hiring research faculty at .97 FTE, apparently to avoid giving them the vote and thus circumvent the quorum issue altogether. Vaughn asked that this issue be added to the FCFA agenda for assessment of positives and negatives, discussion and action.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*

Present: Ceccarelli, Graubard, Hadjimichalakis, Hildebrandt, Luchtel, Wilson, Sjavik, Walker, Cameron, Vaughn
Absent: Kolko, Kirtley, Lydon-Rochelle, Scheuer, Fabien, Roy, Mandoli, Blumenthal, Johnson, Stygall, Parks